

## Exhibit 300: Capital Asset Summary

### Part I: Summary Information And Justification (All Capital Assets)

#### Section A: Overview & Summary Information

**Date Investment First Submitted:** 2009-06-30  
**Date of Last Change to Activities:**  
**Investment Auto Submission Date:** 2012-02-29  
**Date of Last Investment Detail Update:** 2011-09-16  
**Date of Last Exhibit 300A Update:** 2012-08-23  
**Date of Last Revision:** 2012-08-23

**Agency:** 024 - Department of Homeland Security Directorate  
**Bureau:** 65 - National Protection and Programs

**Investment Part Code:** 02

**Investment Category:** 24 - E-Gov & LoB initiatives

**1. Name of this Investment:** NPPD - Information Systems Security Line of Business (LoB)

**2. Unique Investment Identifier (Ull):** 024-999992100

#### Section B: Investment Detail

- 1. Provide a brief summary of the investment, including a brief description of the related benefit to the mission delivery and management support areas, and the primary beneficiary(ies) of the investment. Include an explanation of any dependencies between this investment and other investments.**

In 2005, the Information Systems Security Line of Business (ISS LoB) identified information security services to be shared across government. A multi-agency group defined common solutions focusing in four Activity Areas; continual progress in each of the following Activity Areas will improve IS security to the federal government: 1) security training, 2) FISMA reporting, 3) situational awareness and incident response, and 4) certification and accreditation of security products and services. The ISS LoB investment will improve the level of cyber security across all government agencies, reduce costs by consolidating certain security products and services into centralized Shared Service Centers (SSCs), and improve security decision-making through an agency-neutral governance structure. Currently, the ISSLOB conducts the following in the four Activity Areas: 1) Security Training; currently overseeing activities of 4 security awareness training SSCs. 2) FISMA Reporting; Currently overseeing activities of 2 FISMA reporting SSCs. 3) Situational Awareness and Incident Response; SAIR Tier I BPA awarded in 2009, resulting in \$85M cost savings to date (\$78M in FY11). SAIR Tier II BPA currently undergoing evaluation. SAIR Tier III requirements being drafted. 4) Certification and Accreditation; RMF (C&A) BPA awarded June 2011. Currently overseeing activities of 6 C&A SSCs.

**2. How does this investment close in part or in whole any identified performance gap in support of the mission delivery and management support areas? Include an assessment of the program impact if this investment isn't fully funded.**

If the ISSLOB were not funded, then the program could not sponsor Shared Service Centers (SSCs) or Government-Wide Acquisition Contracts (GWACs) for cybersecurity tools and services. Although agencies can procure these tools and services independently, they cannot achieve the same benefits that are currently available because of the ISSLOB's government-wide scope. The ISSLOB fills gaps for agencies by increasing cost avoidance, standardizing security, and strengthening security posture across government. If the ISSLOB were not funded, these benefits would be unachievable for agencies, including current customers: CFTC; CSOSA; DHS; FL Ntl. Gd.; DOC; DOE; DoEd; DOI; DOJ; DOL; DOT; DLA; EPA; FTC; GPO; GSA; HHS; HUD; NLRB; NARA; NASA; NATO; NV Ntl. Gd.; NJ Ntl. Gd.; NRC; NSA; OMB; OPM; Peace Corps.; SEC; SSA; State; Treasury; USDA; USHMM; USAID; U.S. AF; U.S. Army; U.S. Army Res.; U.S. Courts Admin. Office; U.S. Courts, ND; U.S. Courts OH; U.S. House of Representatives; U.S. Navy; VA; WY Ntl. Gd. If the SSCs are not operational, agencies cannot use offerings such as C&A services and security awareness training (SAT). Successful security programs require these tools/services, and if agencies cannot take advantage of the SSC offerings, they will be required to purchase vendor tools/services at higher prices. This dependency on private sector offerings will mean a loss of cost savings for potential SSC customers. The SSCs submit regular metrics and their offerings must meet ISSLOB standards, so if they are not operational, then agencies will have to use tools and services of varying quality. A lack of standardization of these tools/services results in weaker government-wide security posture. If the ISSLOB cannot sponsor GWACs for cybersecurity tools and services, agencies will have to undergo lengthy procurements to purchase similar offerings at higher prices. Agencies will lose time and money that they could have saved if they had access to ISSLOB-sponsored GWACs. To date, these GWACs have resulted in \$85M in cost avoidance that would have been unachievable were the ISSLOB not funded. As with SSC offerings, the use of ISSLOB-sponsored GWACs allows agencies to implement tools/services that meet ISSLOB standards, creating security standardization that is not possible without the ISSLOB. A lack of security standardization leads to weaker government-wide security posture, thus amplifying cyber risk within agencies and increasing vulnerability to cyber threats.

**3. Provide a list of this investment's accomplishments in the prior year (PY), including projects or useful components/project segments completed, new functionality added, or operational efficiency achieved.**

1. The ISSLOB SAIR Tier I BPA has facilitated over \$85 Million in cost avoidance across the federal civilian enterprise for the products included therein. Cost avoidance is measured as compared to GSA Schedule 70 pricing. 2. The ISSLOB, in conjunction with GSA has awarded 14 BPAs for federal, state, and local use to procure certification and accreditation services from industry. 3. Established 2 new government shared service centers(SSCs) for C&A services (HHS and Navy, SPAWAR) and 1 new SSC for security awareness training (VA). 4. Authored the CAESARS Reference Architecture and CAESARS Framework Extension for use in developing a government-wide continuous monitoring capability implementation.

**4. Provide a list of planned accomplishments for current year (CY) and budget year (BY).**

1. Release the SAIR Tier II BPA 2. Develop product and service requirements for SAIR Tier III (Continuous Monitoring) BPAs 3. Release SAIR III RFQ 4. Revise SSC performance metrics 5. Release Continuous Monitoring Implementation Guidance 6. Release Security Awareness Training Content Guidance.

**5. Provide the date of the Charter establishing the required Integrated Program Team (IPT) for this investment. An IPT must always include, but is not limited to: a qualified fully-dedicated IT program manager, a contract specialist, an information technology specialist, a security specialist and a business process owner before OMB will approve this program investment budget. IT Program Manager, Business Process Owner and Contract Specialist must be Government Employees.**

2005-03-31

## Section C: Summary of Funding (Budget Authority for Capital Assets)

1.

Table I.C.1 Summary of Funding

	PY-1 & Prior	PY 2011	CY 2012	BY 2013
Planning Costs:	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
DME (Excluding Planning) Costs:	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
DME (Including Planning) Govt. FTEs:	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
Sub-Total DME (Including Govt. FTE):	0	0	0	0
O & M Costs:	\$7.3	\$2.6	\$2.6	\$2.6
O & M Govt. FTEs:	\$0.4	\$0.4	\$0.4	\$0.4
Sub-Total O & M Costs (Including Govt. FTE):	\$7.7	\$3.0	\$3.0	\$3.0
Total Cost (Including Govt. FTE):	\$7.7	\$3.0	\$3.0	\$3.0
Total Govt. FTE costs:	\$0.4	\$0.4	\$0.4	\$0.4
# of FTE rep by costs:	0	0	0	0
Total change from prior year final President's Budget (\$)		\$0.0	\$0.0	
Total change from prior year final President's Budget (%)		0.00%	0.00%	

**2. If the funding levels have changed from the FY 2012 President's Budget request for PY or CY, briefly explain those changes:**

Costs reflect the implementation and execution of the ISSLOB Program Management Office (PMO) for the Department as the managing partner of the ISSLOB. Planning, acquisition and maintenance line items for all existing SSC's (Tier 1 training and FISMA Reporting, and C&A Services) are reflective in the individual SSC agency exhibit 300s, and are not included here.

## Section D: Acquisition/Contract Strategy (All Capital Assets)

Table I.D.1 Contracts and Acquisition Strategy

Contract Type	EVM Required	Contracting Agency ID	Procurement Instrument Identifier (PIID)	Indefinite Delivery Vehicle (IDV) Reference ID	IDV Agency ID	Solicitation ID	Ultimate Contract Value (\$M)	Type	PBSA ?	Effective Date	Actual or Expected End Date
Awarded	7001	<a href="#">HSHQDC09J00069</a>	GS10F0018M	4730							

**2. If earned value is not required or will not be a contract requirement for any of the contracts or task orders above, explain why:**

Contract is for PMO support services, and it has been determined that EVM is not appropriate (Per OMB direction, Stacie M. Boyd email dated 7/16/2006). EVM is being utilized and managed by individual SSC partner agencies where appropriate.

Exhibit 300B: Performance Measurement Report

Section A: General Information

Date of Last Change to Activities:

Section B: Project Execution Data

Table II.B.1 Projects					
Project ID	Project Name	Project Description	Project Start Date	Project Completion Date	Project Lifecycle Cost (\$M)
NONE					

Activity Summary								
Roll-up of Information Provided in Lowest Level Child Activities								
Project ID	Name	Total Cost of Project Activities (\$M)	End Point Schedule Variance (in days)	End Point Schedule Variance (%)	Cost Variance (\$M )	Cost Variance (%)	Total Planned Cost (\$M)	Count of Activities
NONE								

Key Deliverables								
Project Name	Activity Name	Description	Planned Completion Date	Projected Completion Date	Actual Completion Date	Duration (in days)	Schedule Variance (in days )	Schedule Variance (%)
NONE								

## Section C: Operational Data

Table II.C.1 Performance Metrics

Metric Description	Unit of Measure	FEA Performance Measurement Category Mapping	Measurement Condition	Baseline	Target for PY	Actual for PY	Target for CY	Reporting Frequency
% of scorecard agencies utilizing an ISSLOB C&A SSC	Percent	Mission and Business Results - Management of Government Resources	Over target	20.000000	20.000000	10.100000	25.000000	Quarterly
% of scorecard agencies using Security Awareness training solutions as provided by ISSLOB SSCs	Percent	Mission and Business Results - Management of Government Resources	Over target	85.000000	85.000000		90.000000	Quarterly
% of users indicating positive satisfaction with ISSLOB Security Awareness (Tier I) SSCs	Percent	Customer Results - Service Quality	Over target	80.000000	85.000000		90.000000	Quarterly
% of users indicating positive satisfaction with ISSLOB C&A SSCs	Percent	Customer Results - Service Quality	Over target	80.000000	85.000000		90.000000	Quarterly
Cost Avoidance acheived utilizing ISSLOB SAIR BPAs	Dollar	Technology - Technology Costs	Over target	7000000.000000	10000000.000000	78000000.000000	15000000.000000	Monthly
Cost Avoidance acheived utilizng ISSLOB RMF BPAs	Dollar	Technology - Technology Costs	Over target	7000000.000000	0.000000	0.000000	7000000.000000	Monthly
Cost Avoidance	Percent	Technology - Efficiency	Over target	7000000.000000	0.000000	0.000000	7000000.000000	Quarterly